

THE TRUE ISSUE FOR THE TRUE CHURCHMAN.

---

A

# Statement of Facts

IN RELATION TO THE

## RECENT ORDINATION

IN

St. Stephen's Church, New-York.

BY

DRS. SMITH AND ANTHON.

NEW-YORK:

HARPER AND BROTHERS, 82 CLIFF-STREET.

---

1843.

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1843,  
By HARPER & BROTHERS;  
In the Clerk's Office of the Southern District of New-York.

*From the Evening Papers of July 8th, 1843.*

WE had determined to content ourselves with having conscientiously performed our duty on the subject of the late ordination at St. Stephen's, deeming it most prudent that such matters should, as far as possible, be kept within our own body, and not obtruded on the public. The attacks made on us in certain publications in the "Churchman" of this date (July 8), leave us no alternative between a silence, which might be misinterpreted, and a full disclosure, from the beginning, of all the matters connected with this most painful occurrence in the Church. We will, therefore, lay before the public, in a few days, a full statement of the case.

HUGH SMITH, D.D.,

Rector of St. Peter's Church.

HENRY ANTHON, D.D.,

Rector of St. Mark's Church.

*New-York, July 8, 1843.*



Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2017 with funding from

This project is made possible by a grant from the Institute of Museum and Library Services as administered by the Pennsylvania Department of Education through the Office of Commonwealth Libraries

DRS. SMITH AND ANTHON'S

## STATEMENT OF FACTS.

---

IN fulfilment of our promise, we submit the following statement of *facts*, touching the *ordination* of Mr. Arthur Carey to the office of a Deacon in the Protestant Episcopal Church, and the protests against that ordination.

In order clearly to understand the merits of the case, Dr. Smith would call attention to the following particulars—his own personal statement:

Mr. Carey had been connected with the parish of St. Peter's, of which I am rector, for the greater part, if not the whole, of his seminary course. He graduated from the Seminary, and publicly received the usual testimonial granted by the trustees, in June, 1842. Not being then of age, he remained at the Seminary for another year, that he might spend the time necessary to elapse before his ordination in still farther augmenting his stores of information.\* Either at the time of his graduating, or at the commencement of the next term in October, Mr. Carey expressed to me his wish to sever his connexion with St. Peter's, and unite himself with the parish of St. John's.

This fact is here noted with a double object in view, both as bearing upon, because increasing the great reluctance with which I was afterward constrained to decline the signing of his testimonials, and to oppose his ordination—a point to which Mr. Carey himself, on doubt being expressed, called my attention, as strengthening his claim to testimonials at my hand—and also, as evidencing my confidence in him. I had, from an early period of his connexion with St. Peter's, understood that he em-

\* He was merely a resident, and in no way connected with the Faculty and course of instruction.

braeed the doctrines of the Oxford school; but such was my conviction of the purity and excellence of his Christian character, of his quiet and studious habits, and his love for truth, that I was not only willing, but anxious, to have the benefit of his services in my Sunday school. These things being premised, the reader will be prepared for a statement of facts more immediately bearing upon the final issue.

At the close of May, Mr. Carey called upon me, and asked me to procure for him the certificate required by the canon, to be signed by myself and my vestry, as being the rector and vestry of the parish with which he had been connected. This I promised to do. On this occasion, some allusion was made by me to the sentiments reputed to be held by him, and which were regarded by me as unfavourable in tendency, accompanied by the remark that I should have felt, perhaps, very serious uneasiness respecting them but for my high estimate of his moral and spiritual character—the privilege of a pastor being taken to add some advice deemed not unseasonable, which was kindly received, and drew forth, as I believe, an assurance of intended conformity to the Church.

On the evening of the first Tuesday in June, I presented his papers to my vestry for their signatures, giving a cordial testimony to his talents and worth, and at the same time signing *one of the papers* presented as the attesting presbyter. When the other had received the signatures of seven of my vestry, being all who were present, through inadvertence I omitted to add my signature to the *joint* testimonial, intending so to do whenever it should be called for. It was not asked for until the 21st of June, Mr. Carey having been, the mean while, out of town. He called to receive it just as I was recovering from illness. Before my illness, however, I had been informed of expressions used by Mr. Carey, which, in my judgment, rendered it very questionable whether the testimonial could justly be accorded to him. On his asking for his papers, I remarked to him that they had been signed by such of my vestry as were at the meeting, and by me as an attesting presbyter; and that I was entirely ready, and should be most happy to affix my signature as rector of St. Peter's, if I could be satisfied on some points in regard to which I had heard allegations, and desired light. It will

be here borne in mind, that, even had my signature been already affixed, the document was still in my own possession and under my own control, and would not have been delivered to him unless satisfaction had been given as to the expressions ascribed to him.

On stating to him what these declarations were, he very frankly admitted them, one only excepted, which he thought so foreign from his usual mode and habits of expression as to render it most improbable that he could have used it; while he stated, farther, that he had no recollection whatsoever of the expression. It was, therefore, promptly dismissed. Startled by his frank avowal of the most obnoxious of these remarks, one of which had reference to an intimation of his possible entrance into the ministry of the Church of Rome, and the other to his opinions touching the Reformation from Rome, the conversation was naturally directed to other points connected with his views concerning that church. These views were such as to create astonishment and grief, which were most strongly expressed. As the purport of this conversation, and another which followed as its sequel, will appear in a subsequent part of this statement, I would here confine myself to the *history* of the matter. Being still feeble from my illness, and fearful of a relapse, and being also anxious to reflect upon the particulars of a conversation so unexpected and astounding, and to see how far I could call to mind what had been said, and to what it actually amounted, I requested a suspension of it at the end of about two hours, leaving it at the option of Mr. C. to renew it either at eight the following morning, or at eight P.M. the same evening. He chose the latter, and, accordingly, at that hour the conversation was renewed. In the interval, however, in order that I might not trust to mere vague recollections of a conversation so important, and be enabled to do strict justice to him in the decision I was to form as to the matter of his testimonials, as well as have the means of self-vindication, should I be constrained ultimately to refuse my signature, I determined to make a written statement of what I conceived him to have declared to me, and submit the same for his inspection, examination, and correction. This was accordingly done. The statement read to him was the following, prefaced by my assurance that it was to prevent unintentional mistakes of his meaning on my part, subsequent differences

of apprehension as to what he had affirmed or denied, have a correct basis upon which to predicate either my granting or withholding his testimonials, and still feel that, in either case, I would be borne out ; and I begged him, should the language in any case be stronger than he had employed, to modify and weaken it ; in case it were defective, to add what he thought necessary to the true explication of his meaning ; if it did not accord with his recollections, to make it conformable to them ; and if, in any case, it faithfully represented what he *had* said, while he now wished to withdraw, modify, or qualify his expressions, freely so to do. This document was then read to him, as drawn up by me, and with the corrections, substitutions, interlineations, additions, &c., which he made (marked in *Italics*), is as follows :

[DOCUMENT A.]

“ St. Peter's Rectory, 4 P.M., June 21, 1843.

“ In my conversation with Mr. Carey this afternoon, I understood him substantially to admit to me a conversation reputed to have been held, as leading to the general impression that, if union with the Protestant Episcopal Church in this country were not open to him, he would have recourse to the ministry of Rome—not without pain or difficulty, but still that he did not see anything to prevent or forbid such an alternative. That he thought he could receive all the decrees of Trent, the damnatory clauses being excepted.

“ 2. That he did not deem the differences between us and the Church of Rome to be such as embraced any *points of faith*.

“ 3. That he did not deem the doctrine of transubstantiation an absurd or impossible doctrine ; and that he regarded it as meaning no more than what we mean by the *real presence*, which we most assuredly hold.

“ 4. That he does not object to the Romish doctrine of purgatory as defined by the Council of Trent, and that he believed that the state into which the soul passed after death was one in which it could be benefited by the means of moral discipline, and by the prayers of the faithful and the sacrifice of the altar.

“ 5. That he was not prepared to consider the Church of Rome as no longer an integral or pure branch of the Church of Christ ; and that he was not prepared to say



whether she or the Anglican Church were the more pure : that in some respects *she* had the advantage, in others *we*.

“ 6. That he regarded the denial of the cup to the laity as a mere matter of discipline, which might occasion grief to him if within her communion, but not as invalidating her administration of the sacrament.

“ 7. That he admits to have said, or thinks it likely he has said, inasmuch as he so believes, that the Reformation from the Church of Rome was an unjustifiable act, and followed by many grievous and lamentable results.

“ 8. That while generally subscribing to the 6th article,\* so that he would not rely for proofs to himself or others, from Books other than those reputed to be canonical, yet he is not disposed to fault the Church of Rome in annexing others to these, and in pronouncing them all, in a loose sense, Sacred Scripture ; nor was he prepared to say that the Holy Spirit did not speak by these Books Apocryphal.

“ 9. Mr. Carey considered the promise of conformity to the doctrine, discipline, and worship of the Church as not embracing the Thirty-nine Articles in any close and rigid construction of them, but regards them only as affording a sort of general basis of concord, which none subscribed except with certain mental reservations or private exceptions, and that this was what Bishop White had said.”

The following is the same statement, with Mr. Carey's explanations, &c., in Italics :

“ St. Peter's Rectory, June 21, 1843. Evening.

“ In my conversation with Mr. Carey this afternoon, I understood him substantially to admit to me a conversation reputed to have been held, as leading to the general impression that, if union with *the ministry of* the Protestant Episcopal Church of this country were not open to him, he *might possibly* have recourse to the ministry of Rome—not without pain or difficulty, but still that he did not see anything to prevent or forbid such an alternative, *although he thought it much more likely that he would remain in the communion of our Church* ; and that he could receive all the decrees of Trent, the damnable clauses only excepted.

“ 2. That he did not deem the differences between us and Rome to be such as embraced any *points of faith*.

“ 3. That he *was not prepared to pronounce* the doctrine

\* Art. 6, Of the Sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures for Salvation.

of transubstantiation an absurd or impossible doctrine ; and that he regarded it, as *taught within the last hundred years, as possibly* meaning no more than what we mean by the real presence, which we most assuredly hold.

"4. That he does not object to the Romish doctrine of purgatory as defined by the Council of Trent, and that he believed that the state into which the soul passed after death was one *in which it grows in grace*, and can be benefited by the prayers of the faithful and the sacrifice of the altar.

"5. That he was not prepared to consider the Church of Rome as no longer an integral or pure branch of the Church of Christ ; and that he was not prepared to say whether she or the Anglican Church were the more pure : that in some respects *she* had the advantage, in others *we*.

"6. That he regarded the denial of the eucharist to the laity as a mere matter of discipline, which might occasion grief to him if within her communion, but not as *entirely* invalidating the administration of the sacrament.

"7. That he admits to have said, or thinks it likely he has said, inasmuch as he so believes, that the Reformation from Rome was an unjustifiable act, and followed by many grievous and lamentable results ; *he, however, having no question but that a reformation was then necessary, and being far, also, from denying that many good results have followed from it, both to us and Rome.*

"8. That while generally subscribing to the sixth article,\* so that he would not rely for proofs to himself or others, upon passages from Books other than canonical, yet he is not disposed to fault the Church of Rome in annexing others to these, and in pronouncing them all, in a loose sense, Sacred Scripture ; nor was he prepared to say that the Holy Spirit did not speak by the Books Apocryphal. *Mr. Carey alleged himself here to have added that this was the doctrine of the homily.*

"9. Mr. Carey considered the promise of conformity to the doctrine, discipline, and worship of the Protestant Episcopal Church as not embracing the Thirty-nine Articles in any close and rigid construction of them, but regards them only as affording a sort of general basis of concord—as those which none subscribed except with certain mental reserva-

\* Art. 6, Of the Sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures for Salvation.

tions and private exceptions, and that *this was what he regarded as Bishop White's view.*"

When these points, as stated by myself and corrected by him, had been discussed, several others came under consideration. He declared his conviction of the lawfulness of the invocation of saints; his inability to receive the 22d Article, except under a *special* supposition, with other particulars, especially in regard to articles 11th and 31st, to which articles he gave his assent, but which, in my judgment, he did not satisfactorily reconcile with his other opinions.

Into the detail of the various matters embraced in the closing part of our conversation, it is unnecessary to enter. It is, however, proper that I should state that, on my expressing a doubt whether I might not feel constrained to decline affixing my signature to his testimonial (in which case I would probably deem it due to those who had signed it at my instance, to apprize them of my refusal and my reasons), he objected to my informing them, as it would only embarrass his subsequent proceedings, and would, moreover, put him into the mouth of the public; and inasmuch as the document was incomplete without my signature.

It is proper farther to state, that at this stage, Mr. Carey, with some feeling, adverted to my having noted down the conversation which had passed between us, although, when the statement was first read to him, and submitted to his correction at the opening of our evening interview, he expressed no surprise and interposed no objection; acknowledging, however, my perfect right so to do, but stating that he would not have done so towards me. In reply, I assured him that no one could, more heartily than myself, condemn the minuting down of private, casual, unguarded, confidential conversation, and that never in my life had I stooped to it; but that, in my judgment, the present case was altogether different; one in which I felt myself not merely at *liberty*, but bound in prudence and in fairness to do as I had; that he was himself perfectly aware, from my statement at the commencement of the conversation, of its importance, as tending either to confirm or remove my scruples; and that, being called upon to complete and deliver to him his testimonials, my consent or refusal could be based only on a definite statement, in order to a correct

apprehension of his views. With this explanation I supposed Mr. Carey to be satisfied.\*

Before separating, Mr. Carey was assured that I felt persuaded if his head were wrong, his heart was right; that this conviction would not be without its influence upon my mind; that my heart and feelings were with, but my judgment and conscience against his application; but that I would still farther consider his case in the spirit of the largest charity, and would be ready to communicate my decision at 9 o'clock the following morning. With this understanding, we parted in mutual kindness.

On a full review of the case, my mind had come to the settled conclusion that I would not, because I could not in honesty, sign a testimonial declaring that he "had not written, taught, or *held* anything contrary to the doctrine of the Protestant Episcopal Church." This decision, with the document above referred to (Document A), was subsequently stated to my old and long-tried friend, Dr. Anthon, who promptly declared that in a similar case he could have come to no other conclusion. Mr. Carey not having called on me at 9 o'clock, my decision was made known to him when he called at 1 P.M., as follows:

Chelsea, June 22d, 1843.

MY DEAR SIR,

After a calm and quiet review of our conversation of yesterday, and the most liberal construction of your views, as expressed by yourself, and after a very severe examination of my own motives and feelings, as well as into the line of duty in the case, and earnest supplications for guidance into a right decision, I have come to the conclusion that I cannot sign the testimonial required by the canon, that you "have never written, taught, or *held* anything contrary to the doctrine or discipline of the Protestant Episcopal Church," &c. It was with pain that I formed, and it is with regret I communicate this decision, but it must be regarded as unalterable. Unless appealed to, I shall be silent as to my refusal. Be assured it will not change my high estimate of your moral and religious char-

\* It is worthy of remark, that, while several gentlemen of the highest character for integrity and a nice sense of honour promptly and voluntarily expressed their satisfaction that I had taken this course, as tending to prevent present misapprehensions, and as a proper defence against possible unjust imputations, not one among the many to whom the fact was stated and the document subsequently shown, even hinted a doubt of its propriety.

acter, nor will it prevent me from being what I have long felt myself to be,

Truly and affectionately your friend,

HUGH SMITH.

Mr. Arthur Carey.

Mr. Carey having asked to see me, a brief and somewhat constrained interview, marked, however, by mutual courtesy and kindness, was the result.

Convinced that it was now my duty, at the earliest opportunity, to inform the Bishop of the fact and grounds of my declining to give Mr. Carey his testimonials, I accordingly prepared a letter, to be handed to the Bishop at the meeting of the Sunday School Union, at noon, on the 26th of June. At the meeting, before an opportunity for presenting it had fitly occurred, the Bishop asked me for the minutes of my conversation with Mr. Carey. Before replying to this request, farther than by an inquiry how he obtained the information that any such conversation had taken place, the following letter, which had been previously prepared, was placed in the Bishop's hands.

Chelsea, June 26th, 1843.

RIGHT REVEREND AND DEAR SIR,

I deem it my duty to state to you, that I have felt myself constrained to decline giving to Mr. Arthur Carey, a candidate for orders in this diocese, the certificate required by the canons; and to which, as a member of my parish, he would otherwise have been entitled, on the ground of his *having "held,"* and *now holding,* opinions which are, in my judgment, "contrary to the doctrine and discipline of the Protestant Episcopal Church."

With the highest respect,

I remain, right reverend and dear sir,

Your obedient servant,

HUGH SMITH.

Rt. Rev. B. T. Onderdonk, D.D., Bishop of the }  
P. E. Church in the Diocese of New-York. }

A copy of the statement of my interview with Mr. Carey, as requested by the Bishop, was then handed to him.

On inquiring of him if he knew whether Mr. Carey was taking any steps to obtain testimonials from any other quarter, to my surprise he informed me that he believed he



was getting them from the rector and vestry of Trinity Church. A conversation with Dr. Berrian then took place, in which, in answer to my objections, he gave his reasons for the course he had pursued in the matter. During this interview, it should be stated that I inquired if he could not, *as a member of the standing committee* of the diocese, interpose (now that he was advised of weightier objections to Mr. Carey than he had apprehended) when these papers, which he had been instrumental in furnishing, should come before that body? He said he could not.

On the evening of this day the trustees of the General Theological Seminary commenced their session. Into the particulars of the session it is not necessary here to enter, farther than they are connected with the subsequent course of myself and Dr. Anthon.

A resolution was offered by Dr. A., and seconded by myself, to this effect: that the attention of the examining committee should be directed, as far as practicable, especially in regard to the senior class, to the points at issue between us and the Church of Rome. It was opposed, and by vote laid upon the table. Another motion followed, that the attention of the same committee should be directed to the examination of the students upon the distinctive principles of the Church, which was similarly disposed of. A third, offered the next day, requesting that the sermons prepared during the senior year, and handed to the professor, might be submitted to the committee for inspection, was also laid upon the table. In connexion with these decisions, it was maintained, that *doctrine* came not at all under the cognizance of the Board of Trustees, and that inquiry into the *doctrinal views* of the students was not constitutionally within their province.

We are free to confess that all this tended to nerve us to a fixed determination to apply the closest and most rigid tests where unsoundness in the faith was *suspected*, and to interpose to ordinations every check and impediment which the wise legislation of the Church has authorized, wherever such unsoundness was actually *evidenced*. Upon this determination we have acted, our consciences bearing us witness that, in so doing, we have done our duty to God and the Church.

To proceed: The Bishop, on Wednesday evening, having signified to Dr. Smith his intention of holding a special

examination, at which he desired him to be present, I (Dr. S.) expressed doubts as to the necessity of my attending such examination, after my previous private examination of Mr. Carey for some four hours, and the full statement, made and revised by him, of his opinions. The bishop having stated several reasons in favour of my attendance, at his instance the matter was left open.

Before closing this introductory statement, one fact more must be mentioned, viz., that the document\* several times referred to was shown by Dr. S. to several gentlemen, both of the clergy and laity, sometimes at their request, at other times voluntarily, with a view to the explanation of his (Dr. S.'s) course before the trustees. Two distinguished laymen, to whom it was separately shown, were evidently much surprised at the sentiments which it exhibited, and one of them expressed himself as being deeply grieved.

On Thursday, June 29th, 1843, Drs. Anthon and Smith received a written request from the Bishop to attend a special examination of Mr. Carey and Mr. ———, at the Sunday School Room of St. John's Chapel, on Friday evening at 8 o'clock.

#### *Statement of Examination.*

In compliance with the request of the Bishop, we proceeded, on the evening of June 30th, at 8 o'clock, to the Sunday School Room of St. John's Chapel, to attend a special examination of Mr. Carey and Mr. ———, candidates for orders in this diocese. By about half past eight there were in attendance the Bishop, Drs. Berrian, M'Vickar, Seabury, Anthon, and Smith; the Rev. Messrs. Haight, Higbee, and Price; and also Mr. Carey. The Bishop stated, in relation to one of the candidates, that he would not then be examined, as it had been decided by the Faculty that he was to remain in the Seminary another year, and that the only duty which would devolve upon the presbyters then and there assembled was the *special* examination of Mr. Carey. Dr. Smith then rose and read the following paper:

New-York, June 30th, 1843.

We, the undersigned, have been requested by the Right Rev. Benj. T. Onderdonk, D.D., to attend this evening a

\* See Document A, p. 8.

special examination at St. John's Chapel of Mr. Carey and Mr. ———, candidates for orders; and whereas we deem said examination to be one of peculiar importance, therefore, with a view to a definite and precise knowledge of the sentiments of the said individuals, and with a view to our arriving at a correct decision in the premises, we have resolved to propose successively certain questions in writing to the examined, and to request their answers to the same also in writing.

HUGH SMITH.

HENRY ANTHON.

The Bishop then requested that the questions alluded to might all be read successively, which was accordingly done. Objections were then made to these questions, and to their being put and answered in writing. In reply, it was stated by us that this was the mode of examination which we had resolved to pursue as far as *we* were concerned; that we expressly claimed it as our right to pursue this course; that other presbyters were at full liberty to examine the candidate in such mode as they might prefer. The Bishop gave it as his opinion that "questions in writing might be put, but that the examined could not be compelled to reduce his answers to writing." We then requested that the examination might be suspended a few moments, while we retired to prepare a protest, which request was granted; before retiring, however, after some discussion, the Bishop gave it as his opinion that any presbyter present was at liberty to put his questions in writing, and to take down the answers, and read them to the examined. The proposed protest was thereupon waived. And here we deem it our duty to call attention to the fact, that after this decision by the Bishop, objections were several times urged by Drs. Seabury, M'Vickar, Berrian, and Messrs. Haight and Higbee, to the mode of examination, which, in conformity with that decision, was attempted by us to be adhered to, viz., the noting down the answers of the examined; and, farther, that objections were urged against the taking of any notes or memoranda whatsoever. Mr. Higbee expressed his fears that such notes or memoranda might subsequently, even if not used by us, fall into other hands; and he farther objected, that the recording of the *answers only*, however correct, was not just, inasmuch as the attendant explana-



tions and illustrations *verbally* given were not recorded. Here let it suffice to say, that in relation to the present case, these explanations and illustrations, as will subsequently appear, were little worth. Dr. M'Vickar objected on the ground that they might be considered as the record of the proceedings of the examiners—as the minutes of the meeting—which objection was overruled by the Diocesan, on the ground that there was no organized meeting—that we had no secretary, and, therefore, could have no minutes.

Mr. Haight objected to the taking such notes at all, unless with the understanding that, before we separated, THEY SHOULD BE BURNED: to which it was at once replied that such a course would utterly defeat the very object in view, and that we most assuredly SHOULD NOT BURN THEM. After all these objections, the Bishop decided that any of the presbyters present had the undoubted right to use note-book and pencil, and make such memoranda as he pleased, it being understood that they were not to be considered as minutes of a meeting.

It is proper, at this point, to state the fact, that we expressed our willingness and desire to open the door, if it could be safely and conscientiously done, to Mr. Carey's admission to the ministry.

The Bishop then asked if any presbyter had questions to put, when Dr. Anthon proposed question 1 to Mr. Carey. Drs. M'Vickar, Seabury, and Mr. Haight objected to the question on the ground of its being merely "hypothetical in its character." Mr. Carey expressed his willingness to answer. The answer was taken down in writing by Dr. Anthon, read to Mr. Carey, and assented to by him as correct.

The following was the question proposed:

Q. 1. "Supposing entrance into the ministry of the Protestant Episcopal Church in this country were not open to you, would you, or would you not, have recourse, in such case, to the ministry of the Church of Rome?"

Answer. "Possibly I might, after due deliberation, but think that I should more likely remain in our own communion, as I have no special leaning towards the joining of theirs at present."

Dr. Seabury having objected to this question being put, and having advised the examined not to answer, the right thus to advise was questioned by us, as preventing our ar-

living at a knowledge of the sentiments actually held by Mr. Carey, and thus defeating the very object of the examination. The Bishop decided that the candidate might be advised by any one presbyter whom he might select. Dr. Smith then asked of the bishop whether the examined was to be allowed the benefit of counsel. The bishop did not recede from his decision. Exception was taken to the decision, as sanctioning a mode wholly unprecedented; but the exception was not strongly pressed by us.\*

Dr. Smith then proposed question 2 in the following words:

**Q. 2.** "Do you hold to, and receive the decrees of the Council of Trent?"

His answer was, "I do not deny that the decrees of the Council—"

Mr. Carey had proceeded thus far in his reply, when, at the request of Drs. Scabury, Berrian, M<sup>c</sup>Vickar, and Mr. Haight, he declined repeating the words next in order, as Dr. Anthon desired, so as to allow him time to take down the full answer: the advice being grounded upon the loss of time it would occasion to take down, in this manner, all the answers.

Dr. Smith here observed, "Brethren, are we running a race against time? Are we not rather assembled to discharge a solemn duty to the Church, and not to consult our personal convenience? Ought we not to be willing, if necessary, to remain here till 12 o'clock to-night, and to assemble again to-morrow, and remain the entire day, if needful, so as to come to a just conclusion?"

Mr. Carey finally expressed his willingness to repeat his answer to the question, which he did in the following words, which were taken down by Dr. Anthon.

**Ans.** "I do not deny them—I would not positively affirm them."

The examination proceeded, on our part, to question 3.†

\* Here, upon reflection, we are of opinion that a direct protest should have been interposed by us, as, in the entire course of our ministry, of nearly twenty-seven years, we have never known an instance in which this privilege was either asked or accorded.

† We would here mention that we kept memoranda only of the questions proposed by ourselves, and the answers we were enabled to obtain to the same. We did not deem it our duty, and expressly so stated at the time, to keep a record for others, the bishop having decided that each presbyter was at liberty to make his own notes. Should any questions proposed by others, with the answers, be distinctly recollected, they will be stated. To the best of our recollection, no questions were put except by the Bishop, and Drs. Seabury and M<sup>c</sup>Vickar.

**Q. 3.** "Do you, or do you not, deem the differences between the Protestant Episcopal Church and the Church of Rome to be such as embrace *points of faith*?"

To this Mr. Carey was *understood*\* to reply, "If these differences be understood to be matters of doctrine, they would embrace points of faith; but if, as is believed, they are matters of opinion, they would not."

**Q. 4.** "Do you, or do you not, believe the doctrine of transubstantiation to be repugnant to Scripture, subversive of the nature of a sacrament, and giving occasion to superstition?"

"If you do not, how can you *ex animo* subscribe the 28th Article of our Standards?"

Mr. Carey prefaced his answer to this question by reading an extract from "Taylor's Holy Living and Dying," as expressive of his own views, which extract could not by us be taken down; and then more briefly gave his answer in the following words, recorded by Dr. Anthon, and acceded to by Mr. Carey.

*Ans.* "I would answer, in general language, that I do not hold *that* doctrine of transubstantiation which I suppose our Article condemns; but that, at the same time, I conceive myself at liberty to confess ignorance on the mode of the Presence."

**Q. 5.** "Do you, or do you not, regard the denial of the cup to the laity an unwarrantable change in a sacrament of Christ's own institution, or as to be regarded as a mere matter of discipline?"

*Ans.*, taken down by Dr. Smith. "I consider it an *unwarrantable* act of discipline;" Mr. Carey subsequently preferring to substitute the word "*severe*" instead of "*unwarrantable*."

**Q. 6.** "On which Church do you believe the sin of schism rests in consequence of the English Reformation?—the Church of England, and, by consequence, the Protestant Episcopal Church of this country, or upon the Church of Rome?"

Dr. Seabury objected to this question being put, on the ground that it was an *historical* question. Mr. Carey, under advisement, answered, "It is an historical question."

\* In using this form of expression, it must be borne in mind that Mr. Carey's answer is given as far as it could be ascertained, and recorded by us under the constant interruptions and embarrassments of his examination.

Dr. Smith here appealed to the Bishop against this evasion of the question, on the grounds that this was the final examination to test the meetness of the candidate for Deacon's Orders, and that this final examination embraced, according to the canon, among other points, Church History, Ecclesiastical Polity, the Book of Common Prayer, and the Constitution and Canons of the Church, and of the diocese for which he is ordained; the examination on the Ritual, the Articles, and the Canons evidently and necessarily referring to the *historical* questions on their formation, changes, &c.

The Bishop having decided that the question ought to be answered, Mr. Carey, in substance, replied, "that in some respects schism rests on both sides." "He considered both churches in communion with the Church of Christ."

Q. 7. "Is the Romish doctrine of Purgatory in any respects maintained by our Standards?"

The Bishop here asked Dr. Anthon what view *he* entertained on the doctrine of Purgatory, as held by the Church of Rome; to which Dr. Anthon replied, "that, with due respect to the chair, *he* was not under examination."\* The question being then addressed to Mr. Carey, he was understood to say, in reply, "that he considered our Standards as condemning the doctrine *popularly* held to be the Roman doctrine."

Q. 8. "Is there any countenance given in the doctrinal Standards of our Church for the idea that the departed can be benefited by the prayers of the faithful, or by the administration of the Holy Communion? And is not *that* idea condemned by Article 31 of our Church?"

As far as Mr. Carey's answer could be ascertained, it was to this effect: "that he supposed that idea was not condemned in that Article; his opinion being, that the language of the Article was popular language, pointed at a popular opinion which was held against the Church of Rome."

Q. 9. "Do you, or do you not, fault the Church of Rome in pronouncing, as she does, the Books Apocryphal Holy Scripture?"

Ans. "I do not, either to myself or any one else, at-

\* Dr. Seabury, on another occasion, addressed to Dr. Anthon a question of similar character as to his sentiments, to which Dr. Anthon replied by requesting Dr. Seabury to address his question to the candidate under examination.

tempt to prove a doctrine out of the Apocrypha." "The Holy Spirit may have spoken by the Apocrypha, and the Homily asserts the same thing." The question was here renewed, and pressed in several different shapes by the Bishop. The answer elicited by his last question was to the following effect: "I would not fault the Church of Rome for reading the *Apocrypha* for proof of doctrine."

Q. 10. By Dr. Smith. "Can there be a doubt that, in separating from the Church of Rome, the Church of England embraced more pure and scriptural views of doctrine? And is not the Protestant Episcopal Church in this country, at present, more pure in doctrine than the Church of Rome?"

Ans. "There can be a doubt, on the ground that the Church of England *retained* doctrinal errors, viz., the doctrines of Puritanism." "In some points, the Roman missal was preferable to our liturgy." Upon the question put by the Bishop, "What those points were?" Mr. Carey was understood by us, to instance, among other points, "the closer conformity to the ancient liturgies." "He held that, in a popular view, our liturgy was better than theirs in omitting metaphysical distinctions, and also in being in a tongue understood by the people."

Q. 11. "What construction do you put upon the promise of conformity to the doctrines, discipline, and worship of the Protestant Episcopal Church?"

Ans. "He did not consider (as we understood Mr. Carey to say) the articles as binding our consciences in points of faith," and read a passage from "White's Memoirs of the Church" (Convention of 1801), which he considered as maintaining the same opinion.

"He does not feel himself obliged to give his *ex animo* assent to the Thirty-nine Articles, as the assent is given in the English Church."

Previous to our putting to Mr. Carey our twelfth question, the following questions were put by us to him:

Q. 1. "Can you subscribe to the 22d Article?"\*

Ans. "I could subscribe to it, considering it as referring to the popular doctrine of the Romish Church."

It was here objected to the candidate by Dr. Smith, that the change made in the article disproved the idea of its re-

\* Art. 22, concerning Purgatory, Pardons, Worshipping, and Adoration, &c.



ferring to the popular doctrine. As the article stood in the reign of Edward VI., it was styled "the doctrine of the schoolmen;" but after its endorsement by the Council of Trent, it was styled the "*Romish doctrine*."

Touching the doctrine of the invocation of saints, mentioned in this article, the question was asked by Dr. Smith "whether that doctrine had any warrant in Scripture." He replied that "it had not." The question was farther put by Dr. S., "whether it were right to introduce or observe the practice without any warranty from Scripture;" to which it was replied "that it was not forbidden." The examination was farther prosecuted by the bishop, when the candidate, in reply to a question touching the lawfulness of the practice, was understood to say that "he did not fault the Church of Rome, provided the invocation was confined to the '*ora pro nobis*,' or intercessory form."

Q. 2. "How do you understand the last clause of the 19th article, viz., 'As the Church of Hierusalem, &c., have erred, so also the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith?'" The answer was substantially this: "I understand the article in an historical sense—as referring to the *past*, and not to the *present* state of the Church of Rome." The last section of the article he considered "as directed against the abiding infallibility of the Church of Rome, as a particular branch of the Church universal." The question was then pressed in another form, viz.: "Do you consider the Church of Rome *now* to be in error in matters of faith?"

Dr. Seabury\* here repeatedly objected to the candidate's answering, and he accordingly declined answering. The question, however, being pressed, and the bishop deciding that it must be answered, the final reply was in the following words, taken down by Dr. Anthon:

Ans. "It is a difficult question, which I do not know how to answer; but I refer to my answer on the other question, touching my opinion of the decrees of the Council of Trent."

\* It is here proper to state, that Dr. Seabury several times, in the course of this examination, made suggestions to the candidate, and offered explanations of his, Mr. Carey's meaning, which induced Dr. Smith, on one occasion, to say, "Dr. Seabury, I would be happy if you would permit the candidate to answer for himself, as I wish to know, not what you think or believe, but what *he* believes." Dr. M'Vickar interrupted Dr. Anthon's examination several times, which led that gentleman to remind Dr. M'Vickar, that as he, Dr. M'Vickar, had been allowed to put his questions to the candidate without interruption, Dr. Anthon hoped he might have the same privilege.

Q. 3. "Do you, or do you not, receive the articles of the Creed of Pius IV.?"

Ans. "So far as they are repetitions of the decrees of the Council of Trent, I receive them." These words were taken down by Dr. Anthon.

It is here proper to say, that we, not being satisfied with the result of the examination as thus far conducted, at this point determined, in justice to ourselves and Mr. Carey, to fall back upon the statement of his views made to Dr. Smith, and subsequently, with other points deemed by Dr. Smith somewhat extenuating, placed in the hands of the bishop, and by him previously shown to Mr. Carey. Objections were strongly urged against the reading of this document, as that with which the examiners had nothing to do; to which it was replied by Dr. Smith, that at an earlier period in the examination Mr. Carey had verbally said that he should go back from no declarations which he had made, and that this document contained most important declarations made by him, and which, on the reading of that part which was deemed unfavourable to him, had been altered and amended so as to express what he acknowledged to be his views, as already stated in a previous part of this narrative. The bishop decided that the document\* could not be read.

The question was then asked by Dr. Smith: "Bishop, am I at liberty to ask any questions of the candidate which occur to me?" he replying in the affirmative. Dr. Smith then remarked that he should predicate certain questions on the document, the reading of which had been ruled out. To this course the bishop made no objection, and it was therefore pursued.

The matter of that document, *as far as it had been supposed to establish Mr. Carey's unsoundness in the faith and conformity with Rome*, was then thrown into the form of interrogatories, which were addressed to the candidate in the *very words of the document, which had been revised and altered by himself so as to express his views, and assented to by him, as already stated*. To these interrogatories Mr. Carey gave direct and categorical replies, each and every one of which showed that he deviated in no important particular from the doctrinal statements contained in the said

\* See p. 8.

document.\* When Dr. Smith came to that part of the document which he had regarded and presented as extenuating to Mr. Carey, *and which had not been shown by him (Dr. Smith) to Mr. Carey before being handed to the bishop*, a discussion arose as to its admissibility; but at the request of Mr. Carey, who stated that he wished to make certain *explanations* touching parts of the same, it was ruled by the bishop that it should be read, and it was read accordingly. For these exceptions and explanations on the part of Mr. Carey, and Dr. Smith's replies to the same, see Dr. Smith's protest of July 1st, p. 30.

During this discussion, it was asserted by Mr. Haight that there were *two documents* which had been shown by Dr. Smith, one unfavourable and the other favourable, and that in many cases the latter was withheld.

This allegation was promptly denied and disproved by Dr. Smith, the documents, as far as they referred to Mr. Carey's supposed doctrinal errors, being identical; a few additional particulars, *supposed* to be favourable to Mr. Carey, being included in the latter part of the one, which had not occurred to Dr. Smith when the other was penned; yet these very particulars were afterward matter of objection by Mr. Carey. (See protest of July 1st, p. 30.) Dr. Smith farther stated that he had invariably showed the document *not* objected to by Mr. Carey, as the other was in the hands of the bishop, he having omitted to return it at the time promised.

The examiners were then asked if they had any farther questions to propose, and answering in the negative, Mr. C. was requested to withdraw, and withdrew accordingly. †

The bishop then proceeded to ask the presbyters present, in the order of seniority, their opinions *individually*. It should here be distinctly noted and borne in mind, that there was no question put to the presbyters as a board or committee, admitting of a majority and minority vote, the bishop repeatedly having stated that we were no organized committee, and not a corporate body; consequently, the

\* The reader is *particularly* requested to refer to p. 23, containing Dr. Smith's first protest of July 1st, and the statements which are subjoined as an integral portion thereof.

† We have already stated that, to the best of our recollection, no questions were put to the candidate by others, except the bishop, Drs. Seabury and M<sup>c</sup>Vicar. Mr. Carey, in his replies to such questions, did not essentially modify or alter his opinions as they were conveyed in his answers to Drs. Smith and Anthon's questions.



opinion of each individual presbyter stood separately and singly on its *own merits*, without reference to that of other presbyters, and was to be maintained, justified, and carried out, before God and the Church, as his own conscience should dictate. Dr. M'Vickar, with some reservations, expressed himself as favourably impressed by Mr. Carey's examination. Dr. Berrian also expressed himself favourably. Dr. Anthon said that the results of the examination, to his mind, were altogether unfavourable to Mr. Carey; and added, that he might deem it necessary to make a communication the following day to the bishop. Dr. Smith stated that, on the whole, the examination had been most unsatisfactory to himself and most unfavourable to the candidate; and that, while he was not prepared to say that he would do so, he thought it probable that he would farther communicate with the bishop to-morrow. Dr. Seabury said he should esteem it a privilege to present the candidate for orders, as he had sustained his ordeal most nobly. Dr. Anthon then added, that, in the whole course of his ministry, he had never attended an examination conducted in a manner so painful, and in which so many *impediments* were thrown in the way of his arriving at a definite knowledge of the candidate's views. Messrs. Haight, Higbee, and Price expressed themselves satisfied; the latter gentleman was understood to say, that although he had objected to presenting the graduating class for orders, yet he now felt free to express his willingness to present Mr. Carey. The bishop then said that he was not prepared to say that he would ordain Mr. Carey; that he should form his determination with care, and supplication for Divine guidance; and that, when formed, whatever it might be, it should be carried out, without regard to consequences—which he was willing to leave with God, and trusted that he should receive a kind construction of his motives. Drs. Anthon and Smith severally expressed their conviction that such would be the bishop's course, and that they fully believed that it was *his wish* that his presbyters should do the same; and that, whatever might be their course, they trusted they would have credit for obeying the dictates of their consciences. To this remark the bishop at once cordially responded. Dr. M'Vickar then very kindly expressed his regret should he, unintentionally, have wounded the feelings of any of his brethren; and, moreover, intimated a hope

that no use would be made of the notes taken by Drs. Anthon and Smith.

We immediately responded to this kind disclaimer, stating, however, that we waived for the present any reference to the *notes*, as a point in which we might not accord with Dr. M'Vickar, and proceeded more generally to express our regret for any remarks that might have fallen from us, during the course of the examination (of which we disclaimed any consciousness), which could at all have been supposed wanting in respect and courtesy to the bishop and the brethren assembled; and it may be proper here to add, that acknowledgments were made to the bishop for the kindness and courtesy he had manifested to us during the evening. Explanations were also offered by others of the brethren. Before we separated, Dr. Seabury remarked that he understood Dr. Anthon to have disclaimed all intention of making public the notes taken; to which Dr. Anthon immediately replied, that "he had at no time made such a disclaimer; that he did not intend, with those notes, to place himself in the attitude of an aggressor, but that he might be compelled to use them in self-defence." Dr. Smith also remarked to Dr. Seabury "that he held the notes taken by himself as wholly under his own control, and to be used at his own discretion; and that, while he should deprecate publication, he could conceive of circumstances in which duty to himself and the Church might render it necessary."

The brethren then separated, with the understanding between the bishop and ourselves that, if we had any communication to make, it would be made *in writing*, if possible, by one o'clock the following day.

We (Drs. Anthon and Smith) parted from each other with a mutual agreement that we would calmly review the entire subject with earnest prayer, and meet each other in the morning prepared to communicate the result to which each had separately arrived; that result will be seen in the protests which follow; and which, having been separately prepared by us, were handed in person, in one envelope, to the bishop, at 2 P.M. on Saturday.\*

And here, before presenting these to the reader, may we be allowed a few remarks as to the effect produced on our minds, as ministers of the Protestant Episcopal Church,

\* A note had previously been sent by us to the bishop, informing him that we would communicate with him as shortly after the hour fixed (1 P.M.) as possible.

by the examination *as a whole*. That effect was the confirmation, strong and sure, of our previous impressions as to his unsoundness; and how could it be otherwise? He deemed the differences between us and Rome such as embraced no points of faith—doubted whether the Church of Rome or the Anglican Church were the more pure—considered the Reformation from Rome unjustifiable, and followed by grievous and lamentable results, though not without others of an opposite character—faulted not the Church of Rome for reading the Apocrypha for proof of doctrine—did not consider that we were bound to receive the Thirty-nine Articles of our Church in any close and rigid construction of the same—declared that he knew not how to answer the question, which had been repeatedly asked, Whether he considered the Church of Rome to be now in error in matters of faith?—was not prepared to pronounce the doctrine of transubstantiation an absurd or impossible doctrine; and regarded it, as taught within the last hundred years, as possibly meaning no more than we mean by the doctrine of the real presence—did not object to the Romish doctrine of purgatory, as defined by the Council of Trent. Thus far for the NEGATIVES: now for the AFFIRMATIVES. He believed that the state of the soul, after death, was one in which it could be benefited by the prayers of the faithful and the sacrifice of the altar—regarded the denial of the cup to the laity as a severe act of discipline only—justified the invocation of saints—in one instance declared that he did not deny, but would not positively affirm, the decrees of the Council of Trent; in another, that he received the articles of the Creed of Pius IV. so far as they were repetitions of the decrees of that council! And what were the explanations already alluded to, the record of which was deemed by one\* presbyter so important, and which weighed, it seems, with our diocesan, and six of our brethren, against such a mass of evidence as that presented in the examination, and here summed up? To our apprehension, they amounted virtually to nothing. Insulated passages from individual authorities were quoted, the bearing of which was, in our view, questionable, and which, even if pertinent, could never sustain the candidate against the standards of the Church; nice, metaphysical,

\* Rev. Mr. Higbee.

and cobweb distinctions—"distinctions without a difference"—scholastic subtleties, in connexion with the advice of a subtle polemic—refusal, under advisement, to answer plain and legitimate questions; and the answering them, at last, with ingenious and most guarded reserve! Could these have availed—ought they to have availed, against the direct and overwhelming evidence in the case? Were we not borne out, then, in protesting against the ordination of the candidate? Fearlessly do we here appeal to the memories and the hearts alike of the clergy and the laity, who knew the Church in other days—the palmy days of White and Hobart, and Ravenscroft and Bowen—when the banner was lifted up, and under which we enlisted with all the ardour and energy of youth, and have since been ever found contending for the truth—THE BANNER OF EVANGELICAL TRUTH—APOSTOLIC ORDER—whether *such sentiments* as those expressed by the candidate were tolerated in, or even obtruded upon the Church? In our souls do we believe that the distinct avowal of *one* of these "erroneous and strange doctrines," of which so *many* were openly avowed by Mr. Carey, would *then* have closed against an applicant every avenue to the ministry.

To return to our statement. The following were the protests already alluded to:

*To the Right Rev. B. T. Onderdonk, D.D.*

Saturday, July 1st, 1843.

RIGHT REVEREND AND DEAR SIR,

I, the undersigned, having at your request attended an examination of Mr. Arthur Carey last evening, at St. John's Church, and having endeavoured, as far as was practicable under the circumstances of the case, to ascertain the sentiments actually held by that gentleman, by giving due heed to his remarks and explanations, and having subsequently reviewed the whole subject with the utmost care and impartiality, under a solemn sense of accountability to God, and with prayer for his guidance and direction into the judgment of truth and righteousness—find that that gentleman, in no important particular, deviates from the doctrinal statements already made by him to me, and which I felt it my duty to place in your hands, as evidencing unsoundness in the faith—nay, that he has avowed and confirmed them—of which statements a copy is subjoined,



forming an integral part of this communication. Therefore, remembering the vow made at my ordination, that, the Lord being my helper, I would be ready to banish and drive away from the Church all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God's Word, and persuaded that Mr. Carey, with his present avowed opinions, ought not to be admitted to the ministry of the Church, I feel it my duty to God and the Church *most solemnly* to protest, and, accordingly, hereby do *protest, against his ordination*.

I beg leave, right reverend and dear sir, respectfully to request your decision in the premises at the earliest possible period after it is formed. At all events, in sufficient time to enable me to take, if needful, the last and most painful step pointed out by the Church.

I remain, right reverend and dear sir,

Respectfully, your obedient servant,

HUGH SMITH.

*Copy of Statements made to me by Mr. Carey, as above alluded to.*

St. Peter's Rectory, 4 P.M., June 21st, 1843.

In my conversation with Mr. Carey this afternoon, I understood him substantially to admit to me a conversation reputed to have been held, as leading to the general impression that, if union with the ministry of the Protestant Episcopal Church of this country were not open to him, he might possibly have recourse to the ministry of Rome—not without pain or difficulty, but still that he did not see anything to prevent or forbid such an alternative, although he thought it much more likely that he would remain in the communion of our Church; and that he thought he could receive all the decrees of Trent, the damnatory clauses only excepted.

2. That he did not deem the differences between us and Rome to be such as embraced any *points of faith*.

3. That he was not prepared to pronounce the doctrine of transubstantiation an absurd or impossible doctrine; and that he regarded it, as taught within the last hundred years, as possibly meaning no more than what we mean by the *real presence*, which we most assuredly hold.

4. That he does not object to the Romish doctrine of purgatory as defined by the Council of Trent, and that he believed that the state into which the soul passed after

death was one in which it grows in grace, and can be benefited by the prayers of the faithful and the sacrifice of the altar.

5. That he was not prepared to consider the Church of Rome as no longer an integral or pure branch of the Church of Christ; and that he was not prepared to say whether *she* or the Anglican Church were the more pure: that in some respects *she* had the advantage, in others *we*.

6. That he regarded the denial of the cup to the laity as a mere matter of discipline, which might occasion grief to him if within her communion, but not as entirely invalidating the administration of the sacrament.

7. That he admits to have said, or thinks it likely he has said, inasmuch as he so believes, that the Reformation from Rome was an unjustifiable act, and followed by many grievous and lamentable results; he, however, having no question but that a reformation was then necessary, and being far, also, from denying that many good results have followed from it, both to us and Rome.

8. That while generally subscribing to the sixth article,\* so that he would not rely for proofs to himself or others, upon passages from Books other than canonical, yet he is not disposed to fault the Church of Rome in annexing others to these, and in pronouncing them all, in a loose sense, Sacred Scripture; nor was he prepared to say that the Holy Spirit did not speak by the Books Apocryphal. Mr. Carey alleged himself here to have added that this was the doctrine of the homily.

9. Mr. Carey considered the promise of conformity to the doctrine, discipline, and worship of the Protestant Episcopal Church as not embracing the Thirty-nine Articles in any close and rigid construction of them, but regards them only as affording a sort of general basis of concord—as those which none subscribed except with certain mental reservations and private exceptions, and that this was what he regarded as Bishop White's view.

[The following parts of this communication were not shown to Mr. Carey, as they were such as were thought by me to extenuate what preceded, and to present him in a more favourable point of light.]

On the other hand, Mr. Carey said that he could sub-

\* Art. 6, Of the Sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures for Salvation.

scribe to all the articles, *ex animo*, except the 22d,\* but subsequently said he would include that also, if it might be understood as referring to the *popular* Romish doctrine on the several points, and not to the *written*.

He farther said, that, if ordained, he meant to be an obedient son of the Church, and that he did not intend to teach these doctrines or views. (See Note 1.) I asked him, then, if I might not regard these as mere speculative notions, while, practically, he would act upon others. (See Note 2.) He said I might so regard them if I pleased, but they were his carefully-formed opinions, as thoroughly embraced from study and conviction as could be supposed in the case of so young a man, and that he saw no probability of his changing them. He farther said, all his early bias and sympathies were with the Church, and not with Rome, though he still thought of her and her teaching as he had expressed. I asked him how, with his present views, he could defend the Church, if attacked by the Romanists. He replied that he supposed he would, in that case, dwell upon the *less pure* parts of Rome, in contrast with the *more pure* points of our own Church.

On his repeating his intention to be a docile son of the Church, I reminded him of an expression that he was said to have used, and which he did not deny, viz., that in approximation to Rome he went probably to the farthest limit which was possible without forfeiting allegiance to our own Church; and I said, that if he acted on this principle, he could not be, in my judgment, a true son of the Church, but would insensibly get upon Romish ground, and, while in the ministry of the Church, still be, in mind and spirit, with Rome.

Note 1.—It is proper to add, that at his examination I understood Mr. Carey to say, that, had this been shown him, he would have modified this language, as he thought it might be understood as if he held views which he thought it wrong to teach—although he expressed himself satisfied that it was not my intention to convey such meaning. He explained himself, as I understood, to this effect: that he meant to be plain and practical in his preaching; but, on the proper occasions, and before proper persons, would be willing to maintain and advocate all that he believed.

Note 2.—To this phraseology Mr. Carey also made

\* Article 22, Of Purgatory.

some exception, not distinctly recollected, but believed to be based upon an implied supposition that he could be capable of duplicity. As the phraseology objected to was that of my question, and, to the best of my recollection, was that used; and as I certainly should have scorned to suggest such action to Mr. Carey, and have more fully, and, it is to be believed, satisfactorily explained the drift of the question, nothing more need be said on this point.

HUGH SMITH.

*To the Right Rev. B. T. Onderdonk, D.D.*

New-York, July 1, 1843.

RIGHT REVEREND AND DEAR SIR,

I have attended at your request, and as one of your presbyters, a special examination of Mr. Arthur Carey, a candidate for orders in this diocese, and have endeavoured to arrive at a satisfactory knowledge of the sentiments of the said candidate, so far as it was practicable for me to do, *under the circumstances of the case, during the progress of his examination.* Having reviewed the entire matter with prayer and supplication to God for his help and guidance, and for the purpose of coming to a true, impartial, and conscientious decision—one by which I must abide both here and hereafter—I find myself bound to adhere solemnly to the judgment which I then expressed in the presence of my diocesan and that of my brother presbyters: to wit, that the result of such examination, to my mind, was altogether unfavourable to the party. Calling to remembrance, under this conviction, the vow which I made at my ordination, in the sight of God and of the people, and being fully and firmly persuaded that Mr. Carey, with his present avowed sentiments, ought not to be admitted to the ministry of the Protestant Episcopal Church, I feel it to be my bounden duty to place in your hands, as I hereby do, my solemn protest against his admission. I beg leave, right reverend and dear sir, respectfully to request to be informed of your decision in the case at the earliest period after it has been made, so as to enable me to take, if requisite, the only remaining step in my power to prevent the candidate's ordination.

I remain, right reverend and dear sir,

Respectfully yours,

HENRY ANTHON.



Not wishing here to obtrude upon the public our private feelings in the interval, we would simply state, that each of us had separately reached the same conclusion on Sunday morning as to the proper course of duty, and had respectively prepared a final protest, to be read should the bishop have decided to proceed to the ordination of Mr. Carey. No answer having been received from the bishop to the request contained in the close of our protests of Saturday, the following correspondence took place on Sunday.

## COPY OF NOTES SENT AND RECEIVED, JULY 2.

1. *From Dr. Anthon to the Bishop.*

St. Mark's Rectory, 8 A.M., July 2, 1843.

RIGHT REVEREND AND DEAR SIR,

Will you permit me respectfully to inquire what is your decision in the case of Mr. Arthur Carey? The bearer will wait for your answer.

Very truly and respectfully yours,

HENRY ANTHON.

2. *Bishop's Reply, received at 9 A.M.*

Franklin-street, July 2, 1843.

REVEREND AND DEAR SIR,

It pains me to be obliged to say, that the attitude of threatening, which you thought proper to assume at the close of your letter of yesterday, precludes the propriety of my replying to it.

Yours very truly,

BENJAMIN T. ONDERDONK.

Rev. Dr. Anthon.

3. *Written, and sent immediately in reply.*

St. Mark's Rectory, 9 A.M., July 2, 1843.

RIGHT REVEREND AND DEAR SIR,

Without a moment's delay, I disavow all intention of assuming "the attitude of threatening," which, to my utter astonishment, you ascribe to me in your note just received.

Most respectfully yours,

H. ANTHON.

At an early hour in the morning, Dr. Smith despatched by the sexton the following note :

E

Chelsea, July 2, 1843.

RIGHT REVEREND AND DEAR SIR,

HAVING received no reply to my communication placed in your hands yesterday, permit me now, most respectfully, to solicit the favour of a definite reply to the question, whether you purpose ordaining Mr. Carey this morning, with the other candidates for holy orders, at St. Stephen's Church? I deem the knowledge of this fact essential to a just discharge of my duty in the premises, alike to my own congregation and to the Church at large. The favour of a written reply, however brief, is requested.

Right reverend and dear sir,

Your obedient servant,

HUGH SMITH.

Right Rev. Benjamin T. Onderdonk, D.D.

The reply of the Bishop, received at a quarter past 9 o'clock, was in the same words with his reply to Dr. Anthon. To which note of the Bishop Dr. Smith immediately wrote as follows:

*To the Right Rev. B. T. Onderdonk, D.D.*

RIGHT REVEREND AND DEAR SIR,

PERMIT me to assure you, most earnestly, that the concluding part of my letter, addressed to you yesterday, was by no means intended as a threat, but simply as an avowal of an ulterior course, in case it should be deemed necessary; which, it struck me, was due to yourself, in all fairness, and was farther intended to show the necessity of an early reply. Should you still consider it as implying a threat after this disavowal, let me beg you to consider it withdrawn.

Right reverend and dear sir,

Most truly yours,

HUGH SMITH.\*

As soon as we had despatched these notes, we proceeded together to St. Stephen's, with the purpose of seeking an interview before divine service with the bishop, and renewing in person the same disavowal. This was done by

\* Dr. Smith had written his reply at his own residence; but, as time pressed, and he had no one by whom he could forward it to the bishop, he brought his note to Dr. Anthon's, and it was sent from his house to the bishop at St. Stephen's.

both in the Sunday School Room. The bishop expressed himself satisfied with our assurances on this point; and upon our asking whether we might *then* (after our prompt and full disclaimers) renew our inquiry to be made acquainted with his decision, informed us that Mr. Carey was to be ordained. We then took our leave, and entering the Church, united in the service until the time of the ordination.

On the appeal being made by the bishop, "Brethren, if there be any of you who knoweth any impediment or notable crime in any of these persons presented to be ordered deacons, for the which he ought not to be admitted to that office, let him come forth in the name of God, and show what the crime and impediment is." Both of us arose from our seats in one of the pews in the middle aisle, and read successively as follows:

*Document read by Dr. Smith at St. Stephen's, July 2, upon the call of the Bishop.*

Upon this solemn call of the Church, made by you, reverend father in God, as one of its chief pastors, I, Hugh Smith, Doctor in Divinity, a presbyter of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the diocese of New-York, and rector of St. Peter's Church, come forth, in the name of God, to declare, before Him and this congregation, my solemn conviction and belief, that there is a most serious and weighty impediment to the ordination of Mr. Arthur Carey, who has now been presented to you to be admitted a deacon, founded upon his holding sentiments not conformable to the doctrines of the Protestant Episcopal Church in these United States of America, and in too close conformity with those of the Church of Rome, as more fully set forth in a protest from me, placed in your hands yesterday. Now, therefore, under a sacred sense of duty to the Church, and to its Divine head, who purchased it with his blood, I do again, before God and this congregation, thus solemnly and publicly protest against his ordination to the diaconate.

Dated this 2d day of July, 1843.

HUGH SMITH.

*Document read by Dr. Anthon at St. Stephen's upon the call of the Bishop.*

REVEREND FATHER IN GOD,  
I, Henry Anthon, Doctor in Divinity, a presbyter of the

Protestant Episcopal Church in the diocese of New-York, and rector of St. Mark's Church, in the Bowery, being present in St. Stephen's Church on this third Sunday after Trinity, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and forty-three, the time appointed by the bishop for an ordination of deacons, and being under *a firm and full persuasion in the case*, as has been heretofore stated in a written communication made to you, dated the first day of July of the same year, do now come forth, and in the name of God, show, as an impediment, that Arthur Carey, who has at this time been presented to be admitted deacon, *holds things contrary to the doctrine of the Protestant Episcopal Church in these United States, and in close alliance with the errors of the Church of Rome.*

Dated this 2d day of July, 1843.

HENRY ANTHON.

These documents having been read, we again took our seats. The bishop then rose, and expressed himself to the following effect (as reported in the communication signed N. E. O. in the Churchman of July 8, and which, the editor informs us, comes from "a source entitled to the highest respect") :

"The accusation now brought against one of the persons to be ordered deacons has recently been fully investigated by me, with the knowledge and in the presence of his accusers ; and with the advantage of the valuable aid and counsel of six of the worthiest, wisest, and most learned of the presbyters of this diocese, including the three who are assisting in the present solemnities.\* The result was, that there was no just cause for rejecting the candidates' application for holy orders. There is, consequently, no reason for any change in the solemn service of the day ; and, therefore, *all* these persons being found meet to be ordered, are commended to the prayers of the congregation."

We presume the *full* investigation above referred to must have been the examination of Friday evening, which has been already detailed, as no other examination at which *we* were present was held ; and certainly NONE SUBSEQUENTLY TO OUR PROTESTS OF SATURDAY, AS THE PUBLIC HAVE BEEN LED TO IMAGINE, AT THE CLOSE OF WHICH ONLY EXAMINATION,

\* Dr. Berrian, and Messrs. Haight and Price. The candidates were presented to the Bishop for orders by Mr. Haight.

HELD IN OUR PRESENCE, ON FRIDAY EVENING, JUNE 30TH, THE BISHOP STATED THAT HE WAS NOT PREPARED THEN TO SAY WHETHER HE WOULD ORDAIN THE CANDIDATE.

As soon as the bishop had announced his decision, and commended the candidates to the prayers of the congregation, we respectfully withdrew, being under the conviction that our remaining during the ordination and subsequent services would have seemed tacitly to sanction the very act against which we had just solemnly protested—whereas our withdrawing would be a protest *in act*, not less than *in words*.

Laboured defence of our course—a course admitted to have been conscientiously adopted and pursued—is neither demanded by the public nor needful to ourselves. Here, therefore, we should have been disposed to close our statement, had we not deemed it necessary to show the fallacy of some of the positions assumed in certain articles in the *Churchman* of Saturday last, July 8th. Our promise to the public may, perhaps, require from us a notice of those articles, which self-respect would otherwise scarcely have permitted us to accord. Not to “render evil for evil, or railing for railing,” is the Christian’s duty. Facts are better than arguments, and a cause that is strong in the truth needs not vituperation.

As to the novel discovery that the protesting clergy, under the circumstances of the case, did not form a part of “the people,” the common sense of the public will dismiss it as utterly futile. Scarcely entitled to more attention is the quibble, that since the protesters were not prepared to charge upon Mr. Carey “heresy” as “a crime,” therefore they had no right to allege *erroneous opinions* as an “*impediment*.” It proceeds upon the nice distinction between crime in its *popular*, and crime in its *theological* sense; upon the *fallacy* that *error* in opinion is necessarily *criminal*, as though a man could not be (as we supposed Mr. Carey to be) *honestly* in error. The error thus held constitutes an *impediment*, for the which he should not be ordained, but not a crime. Has the editor forgotten that the greater involves the less? Every crime is of course an impediment, but every impediment is not necessarily a crime.

After not the most gentle arraignment of us before the public, the editor of the *Churchman* dismisses us with “the expression of the hope and belief that our action was the



fruit of a "*temporary excitement*." We cannot avail ourselves of an excuse more than equivocal in its character. To have taken a step so painful, involving results and responsibilities of perhaps fearful magnitude, through temporary excitement, would have been unworthy of us as men or as Christians. No: if we sinned, we sinned not through impulse, but with premeditation. From first to last we *pondered* our course. On reading our statement, the public will be at no loss to decide whether we were hot and hasty zealots, or men going calmly and resolutely forward to what they felt to be their duty.

The editor admits us to have acted under a "*sincere*" sense of duty. He does us no more than justice. It remains to be seen whether it was a "*mistaken*" sense of duty.

Stress has been laid upon the fact that *six presbyters*, with *our own diocesan* and *another bishop*,\* were *against us* on the question of the candidate's admissibility to the ministry, as though this decided his meetness, and our presumption in protesting. Not so. This is a turning from the *true issue*, viz., the *facts and grounds of judgment*, to the parties judging. *Impeachment of the motives* of those against us we here expressly disclaim; but IN THIS VERY FACT, intended to convict us of presumption, did we find the *strongest* among other strong reasons that led us to the final step as one of imperative duty. The matter presented itself to us thus: Has it, indeed, come to this, that with such sentiments as those held and avowed by Mr. Carey—with a distinct avowal of the conjoint reception of the decrees of Trent, the Creed of Pius IV., and our own standards, two bishops and six presbyters are ready to further, sanction, and carry into effect his ordination, and that, too, regardless of earnest protests made by two presbyters, who could not reasonably be supposed to have any private and unworthy ends in view; then, indeed, has a crisis been reached, when, humble as we may be in comparison with the reverend fathers and brethren who have come to an opposite decision, it becomes our bounden duty to give our feeble but honest testimony *solemnly* and *publicly* before God and his Church against such an act.

Our act is farther pronounced, by one entitled to so much

\* Right Rev. Levi Silliman Ives, D.D., LL.D., Bishop of North Carolina.

credit, an “*attempt to arrest the legitimate action of the constituted authority of the Church.*” Not so. After every private effort had been tried ineffectually to prevent what we deemed by *no means legitimate* action by that authority, it was a final and conscience-prompted endeavour, *in the authorized manner*, to arrest such action at the very moment when it *was to be consummated*.

It has been objected that the case had been already *adjudicated*. True; but the adjudication (in our judgment so erroneous as to *demand* every proper and permitted appeal) had *not yet been carried into effect*: and our action, strictly in accordance with the wise provision and “conservative character” of the Church, was essayed in the last hope of staying the present execution, with a view to the subsequent reversal of this adjudication; for in our simplicity we supposed the language of the rubric, in the ordination service, to be plain and imperative, admitting of but one construction and one course of action: “And if any great crime or impediment be objected, the bishop shall cease from ordering that person until such time as the party accused *shall be found clear.*”<sup>\*</sup> And *clear*, we aver, he has not yet been found by any tribunal appointed to investigate the charges or having authority to pronounce upon his case. When he can thus *legitimately try himself clear* from the charge of too close conformity with the Church of Rome, against the reiterated statements of his own lips, and the mass of evidence here spread before the public, then evidence must have lost its power!

And in this connexion let there be noted, what, certainly, must be regarded as an assumption in argument, a mere *petitio principii*, viz., that the *bishop* must, in all cases, be sole judge; that his decision must necessarily be right, and all who are *unfortunately constrained to dissent from it necessarily wrong*; and, farther, that the *number* of the advocates is a criterion of the truth of the opinions which they hold. Such is not the case. Not lightly will a right-minded and well-instructed churchman, at any time, differ openly from his bishop; to oppose him will ever cause him pain; but there may be cases in which this will be *unavoidable*. These will ever be *cases of conscience*; and, where conscience is concerned, it would be folly, it

\* “Shall try himself clear” are the words in 3 and 5, Ed. 6.

would be uncharitableness, to construe such opposition into factiousness or rebellion. The opposition may, and must, in such cases, be marked by firmness; for principle is ever firm; but it will be expressed, defended, and carried out into action with deliberation, prudence, and courtesy. We have, as a Church, repudiated the doctrine of papal infallibility; with what shadow of consistency could we contend for the infallibility of an individual bishop? It is possible for a bishop to be wrong, and one or more of his presbyters to be right. And so as to numbers. Truth is not a thing to be put to vote, nor to be decided by names. True humility, indeed, would teach diffidence in individual opinion in exact proportion to the number and the respectability in attainment of those opposing it; but still, truth has an inherent, independent, and indestructible existence, not to be affected by numerical strength or individual weight of character. It may be with the few rather than the many; with the weak rather than the strong; with the humble, not with the exalted.

We have been taunted with forgetfulness of our ordination vow, in not "obeying our bishop and other chief ministers, who, according to the canons of the Church, may have the charge and government over us." A word in defence. Having been nearly twenty-seven years in the ministry, two only of these brethren were before us in the order of seniority, and of any canonical "charge and government over us," on their part, we are profoundly ignorant; nor, in review of many years of past and pleasant intercourse, can we call to mind a single instance in which they challenged our canonical *obedience*. As to the four junior presbyters, possibly our claim upon them might be regarded as rather stronger than theirs upon us; unless, indeed, the crude and *courteous* editor, accustomed to speak "*ex cathedra*," may consider himself as thereby authorized to "lord it over us," and "have dominion over our faith." The taunt, then, we must presume, concerns disobedience to our bishop only. If so, what "godly admonitions" of his did we refuse to follow? for what admonitions did we receive? Our declaration on Friday evening, that we would probably communicate the next day, drew forth no monition that such communication would be fruitless or impertinent. To our protests of Saturday, no answer was received; reply being withheld, as we were subsequently informed, on the ground



that a declaration of contingent action, which, in duty to our diocesan, we had felt bound to make, had by him been *regarded as a threat!* If it were so regarded, was silence the proper response to it? Where was the “godly admonition” against what would have been in us the glaring offence of endeavouring by threats to intimidate our diocesan from the discharge of his spiritual functions? and where, again, we are compelled to ask, was his “godly admonition” against the execution of the supposed threat, as leading to a “disturbance of public worship,” and to a “disorderly, unchurchlike, and unchristian procedure?” A last opportunity was afforded on Sunday morning, in the chapel of St. Stephen’s Church (our very presence and questions, in connexion with our prior declarations, sufficiently indicating our intent)—why were we not then admonished, warned, and entreated to desist? Possibly stress was meant to be laid on *submission to the godly judgment* of our bishop and chief ministers! In reply, we would only say, it may well admit of question whether the decision against which, from the evidence in the case, we were constrained to protest, would have fallen within the purview of the Church, in that guarded expression “*godly judgment.*”

And now, in conclusion, let it be remarked, that a *great issue has been joined*, through circumstances apparently at once casual and trivial. Certainly that issue was not made designedly and by premeditation on our part. It was not at the first even contemplated. We can regard this only as providential; as though God himself had thus unexpectedly opened the way for the discussion, and perhaps the settlement of great principles, and the consequent peace, purity, and prosperity of his Church. From this one great issue we would not have it turned aside to the entertainment of subordinate and personal questions. The point now before the Church is, not simply whether the two presbyters who protested against, or the six who concurred in, the ordination were right, or a question between the presbyters who opposed and the bishop who (sanctioned by the opinion and the presence of another bishop) ordained. Our object is not simply the justification of *self*, important as is such justification to our character and standing; far less is it the needless crimination of our brethren or our bishop. The point of fact, in this case, has its bearing only upon our *judgments*, not our *intentions*.

Purity of intent is matter of consciousness on our part, and has even been conceded to us by those who have assailed us. But the *matter of principle* involved is one of far wider scope and more awful moment. It covers *this whole ground*: Shall virtual conformity with Rome form or not form an *impediment to ordination*? and does not an ordination, held in despite of such conformity, furnish sad and melancholy proof of a growing indifference to those great principles for which, at the era of the Reformation, martyrs died, and a *gradual assimilation* to Rome, which promises, at no distant day, *identity* with her in faith, if not union in polity? It is too late now to press the maxim, "*Obsta principiis*"—*resist the beginnings of evil*. Partially, though possibly too feebly, certainly not successfully, that resistance has been made. The question now is, Shall a *stand* at last be made, and will churchmen finally rally in defence of their own principles and standards, so eminently Scriptural; or will they be content that even they who are to minister to them in holy things shall come to them with a double creed—with the Thirty-nine Articles and the Creed of Pius IV., with the Prayer Book and the Missal?

There are sweet and sacred remembrances clustering around *the Church as she was*. Are churchmen willing that they should be things of *remembrance only*—images of the past, having nothing analogous in the experience of the present or the realities of the future? In receiving the glorious legacy of a Church, pure and primitive alike in doctrine, discipline, and worship, from our fathers and our fathers' fathers, was it that it should suffer *change* or *loss* at our hands? Was it not, rather, that it should be transmitted, in its *unity, purity, and integrity*, to those who shall come after? And *what Christian churchman* will not, in view of the rapid changes effected by the last few years, be ready to exclaim, in deep anxiety, "Whereunto will these things grow?" Our children have been by *baptism* brought within the Church's fold; but into what were we and they baptized? Was it not into the faith as it then was? Was it into a *changeling faith*, that shall go on changing and retrograding year by year, until it becomes identical once more with that system of darkness and delusion, from which, not without conflict and blood, the Church came forth at the Reformation? Let churchmen pause, reflect, and act,

before it is too late. Let them take heed that the cardinal principle of their churchmanship, submission to constituted authority in the individual Church, does not lead them into violation of the authority, defection from the doctrine, innovation in the practice, and betrayal of the interests of *our Church as a whole*. Let them beware of being led off from the facts and the true merits of the case, into airy speculations, metaphysical disquisitions, and subtle disputations on abstruse points, by which it may be attempted to mystify their minds and confuse the subject. Again would we remind them, that the true issue now involved is the issue between *the Church* and *Romanism*.

This issue can only be met, and, as far as we are concerned, will only be met, on the grounds of fact, practical common sense, Church principle, and Scripture. On these we take our stand.

In the words of him by whom we were instructed in the principles of the Gospel and the Church, and trained and sealed to its ministry, we would say, each of us for himself, "There are principles which I should ever desire to be paramount in my soul—the *love of truth, the love of duty*. God grant that I may ever feel that sacred independence which will never sacrifice these principles to considerations of personal interest or feeling. I strike out into no new paths; I advocate no new principles; I arrogate no new discoveries. The *GOOD OLD PATH*, in which the fathers of the primitive Church followed their blessed Master to martyrdom and glory—in which the venerable fathers of the Church of England found rest to their souls—is the path in which I would wish to lead, to a 'rest eternal in the heavens,' myself and those that hear me."\*

HUGH SMITH,  
HENRY ANTHON.

New-York, July 12, 1843.

\* Hobart's Apology.

It may not be unacceptable to the reader to have inserted in this place the following Creed, or Profession of Faith, containing the principal points of belief held by the Church of Rome, as promulgated by Pope Pius IV., in 1564, the year after the close of the Council of Trent. It is required to be subscribed by the members of that Church on various occasions.

### CREED OF PIUS IV.

I, N. N., with a firm faith, believe and profess all and every one of those things which are contained in that creed which the holy Roman Church maketh use of. To wit: I believe in one God, the Father Almighty, Maker of Heaven and Earth, of all things visible and invisible: And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, and born of the Father before all ages; God of God; Light of Light; true God of the true God; begotten, not made; consubstantial to the Father, by whom all things were made. Who for us men, and for our salvation, came down from heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man. Was crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate; he suffered and was buried. And the third day he rose again, according to the Scriptures; sits at the right hand of the Father, and is to come again with glory to judge the living and the dead; of whose kingdom there shall be no end. And in the Holy Ghost, the Lord, and Lifegiver, who proceeds from the Father and the Son, who, together with the Father and the Son, is adored and glorified, who spoke by the Prophets. And (I believe) One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church. I confess one Baptism for the remission of sins; and I look for the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come. Amen.

I most steadfastly admit and embrace Apostolical and Ecclesiastical Traditions, and all other observances and constitutions of the same Church.

I also admit the Holy Scriptures, according to that sense in which our holy Mother the Church has held, and

does hold ; to which it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Scriptures : neither will I ever take and interpret them otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers.

I also profess that there are truly and properly seven sacraments of the New Law, instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord, and necessary for the salvation of mankind, though not all for every one ; to wit : Baptism, Confirmation, the Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Order, and Matrimony ; and that they confer Grace ; and that of these, Baptism, Confirmation, and Order cannot be reiterated without sacrilege. I also receive and admit the received and approved ceremonies of the Catholic Church, used in the solemn administration of the aforesaid sacraments.

I embrace and receive all and every one of the things which have been defined and declared in the holy Council of Trent concerning Original Sin and Justification.

I profess, likewise, that in the Mass there is offered to God a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead. And that in the most holy sacrament of the Eucharist, there is truly, really, and substantially the Body and Blood, together with the Soul and Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and that there is made a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the Body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the Blood ; which conversion the Catholic Church calls Transubstantiation. I also confess, that under either kind alone, Christ is received whole and entire, and a true sacrament.

I constantly hold that there is a purgatory, and that the souls therein detained are helped by the suffrages of the Faithful.

Likewise, that the saints reigning together with Christ are to be honoured and invoked, and that they offer prayers to God for us, and that their relics are to be had in veneration.

I most firmly assert that the Images of Christ, of the Mother of God, ever Virgin, and also of other saints, ought to be had and retained, and that due honour and veneration is to be given them.

I also affirm that the power of indulgences was left by Christ in the Church, and that the use of them is most wholesome to Christian people.

I acknowledge the Holy, Catholic, Apostolic Roman,



Church, for the Mother and Mistress of all Churches ; and I promise true obedience to the Bishop of Rome, successor to St. Peter, Prince of the Apostles, and Vicar of Jesus Christ.

I likewise undoubtedly receive and profess all other things delivered, defined, and declared by the sacred Canons and General Councils, and particularly by the holy Council of Trent. And I condemn, reject, and anathematize all things contrary thereto, and all heresies which the Church has condemned, rejected, and anathematized.

I, N. N., do at this present freely profess, and sincerely hold, this true Catholic faith, without which no one can be saved ; and I promise most constantly to retain and confess the same entire and unviolated, with God's assistance, to the end of my life.



